

1
2 **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

3 Claims 1-31 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 26 have been amended to
4 more particularly point out and distinctly claim the claimed subject matter. No
5 claims have been added, canceled, or withdrawn. Applicant appreciated the
6 opportunity to discuss the subject matter of the pending claims with the Examiner.
7 This Response and the specified claim amendments are a result of that discussion.
8 In view of these claim amendments and the following remarks, withdrawal of all
9 outstanding rejections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

10
11 **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)**

12 Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable
13 over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,449 to Gallagher et al. (“Gallagher”) in view of U.S.
14 Patent no. 6,691,159 to Grewel et al (“Grewal”). These rejections are traversed.

15 **Claim 1** recites “receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first
16 computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page
17 of a Web-based UI of the first computer, the first Web page comprising a user-
18 interface object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a “What is
19 the user-interface object?” or a “Why would I use the user-interface object?”
20 question type”, “responsive to receiving the request, the first computer:
21 determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first Web
22 page”, “generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive
23 information”, and “providing the second Web page to the second computer for
24 presentation”. It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does Gallagher in view of
25 Grewal teach or suggest these claimed features.

1 In addressing claim 1, the 11/03/2004 Office Action (“Action”), at page 3,
2 admits that Gallagher does not teach or suggest “a Web-based UI communication
3 between the first computer and a second computer and determining a set of
4 information that corresponds to the first Web page.” Thus, the Action admits that
5 Gallagher does not teach or suggest either of “receiving a request for context
6 sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request
7 corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer”, and
8 “determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first
9 Web page”, as claim 1 recites. To provide these missing features, the Action
10 modifies Gallagher in view of the teachings of Grewal. In view of this
11 modification, the Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of
12 ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the context sensitive
13 help of the Gallagher to include Web-based UI communication to arrive at the
14 recited features of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following
15 reasons.

16 Claim 1 recites “the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-
17 based UI of the first computer, the first Web page comprising a user-interface
18 object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a “What is the user-
19 interface object?” or a “Why would I use the user-interface object?” question
20 type”. In contrast to the claimed “context-sensitive help” of claim 1, col. 1, lines
21 53-57 of Gallagher describes that “the user double-clicks on the message, a new
22 Web browser window is displayed which includes an HTML page with the
23 message text, a detailed explanation of the message, and recommended user
24 response” [emphasis added]. The message that is being double-clicked on is a
25

1 text-based log message, and the help information presented to the user is help text
2 about the selected log message. Gallagher's selected log message is not part of "a
3 Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer". Clearly, Gallagher is not
4 teaching or suggesting that the user select the log message to obtain specific
5 contextual information about the UI object (e.g., a text UI control) that underlies
6 the log message. Instead, Gallagher discloses that responsive to log message
7 selection, the system of Gallagher retrieves and presents content-specific
8 information to the user about the log message. This is content-specific help, not
9 context-sensitive help. It is respectfully submitted that the content specific help
10 taught by Gallagher is not "context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the
11 user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question
12 type", as claim 1 recites.

13 The Action modifies Gallagher in view of Grewal for the teaching of
14 "receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first computer from the
15 second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based
16 UI of the first computer", and "responsive to receiving the request, the first
17 computer: determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to
18 the first Web page", as claim 1 recited prior to amendment. To address each of the
19 claimed features, claim 1 as amended recites "receiving a request for context
20 sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request
21 corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer, the
22 first Web page comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive
23 help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use
24 the user-interface object?" question type", "responsive to receiving the request, the
25 first computer: determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds

1 to the first Web page”, “generating a second Web page comprising the context
2 sensitive information”, and “providing the second Web page to the second
3 computer for presentation”. Modifying Gallagher in view of Grewal does not
4 teach or suggest any such “context sensitive help” for the following reasons.

5 The Abstract of Grewal, and at col. 1, lines 40-43, clearly disclose and
6 suggest a system to provide users “with education, information and computer
7 assisted help on a specific subject, problem, or a project.” To these ends, Grewal
8 at cols. 3 and 4 describes user interfaces of Figs. 4 and 5, which provide hypertext
9 links for a user to link to FAQs, articles, tips and tricks, tutorials, etc., chat and e-
10 mail capabilities, keyword searches, and so on. Applicant respectfully submits
11 that “help on a specific subject, problem, or a project” provided by links to FAQs,
12 articles, tips and tricks, tutorials, etc., chat and e-mail capabilities, keyword
13 searches, and so on, is not “context sensitive help”, as claim 1 recites.

14 Referring to those portions of Grewal cited by the Action. Grewal at col. 2,
15 lines 22-37 clearly teaches:

16 *“FIG. 1 is a block diagram of a system 10 in accordance with one*
17 *embodiment of the present invention. System 10 includes a server*
18 *system 12 and a plurality of client systems 14 connected to server*
19 *system 12. In one embodiment, a client system 14 is a computer*
20 *including a web browser. Server system 12 is accessible to client*
21 *system 14 via the Internet. Client system 14 is interconnected to the*
22 *Internet through many interfaces including dial-in-connections,*
23 *cable modems, special high- speed ISDN lines and networks such as*
24 *local area networks (LANs) or wide area networks (WANs). Client*
25 *system 14 could be any client system capable of interconnecting to*
the Internet including a web-based phone or other web-based
connectable equipment. Servers storing information are integrated
with server system 12 and can be accessed by potential users at one
of client systems 14 by logging onto server system 12.”

1 Although this portion of Grewal teaches a plurality of client systems can access a
2 server system, this cited portion does not teach or suggest “providing context-
3 sensitive help from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user
4 interface (UI) of the first computer”, and “the first Web page comprising a user-
5 interface object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a “What is
6 the user-interface object?” or a “Why would I use the user-interface object?”
7 question type”, as claim 1 recites.

8 Referring now to Grewal at col. 4, lines 46-65 (i.e., another portion of
9 Grewal cited by the action to support the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 1),
10 Grewal explicitly teaches:

11 *“FIG. 8 describes an algorithm 240 as used by the system to help a*
12 *user when the user logs on to a home page of the web site through*
13 *client system 14. After logging 242, the user requests help through*
14 *client system 14 by selecting one of a hypertext link displayed out of*
15 *all displayed 244 hypertext links. Once the user makes a specific*
16 *selection, the specific selection is sent to server system 12. The*
17 *sending 246 is accomplished in response to click of a mouse or to a*
18 *voice command. Once server system 12 receives 248 the request,*
19 *server system 12 displays the information in response to this request*
20 *on client system 14. Server system 12 accesses 250 the database and*
21 *retrieves 252 related information from the database. The requested*
22 *information is provided 254 to client system 14 by downloading the*
23 *information from server 12. In one embodiment, client system 14 as*
24 *well as server system 12 are protected from access by unauthorized*
25 *individuals.”*

21 This cited portion of Grewal teaches that a user logged on to a homepage in
22 a web site may request help by selecting a hypertext link to obtain computer-
23 assisted help. In particular, a help request is communicated to a server; the server
24 accesses the requested information and sends it back to the requesting client. As
25 Grewal clearly teaches at col. 1, lines 39-42, these operations are part of “an

1 integrated approach to providing users of the computer system with education,
2 information and computer-assisted help on a specific subject, problem or a
3 project.” For the reasons already discussed, “help on a specific subject, problem,
4 or a project” clearly does not disclose or suggest “the request for context-sensitive
5 help being based on a “What is the user-interface object?” or a “Why would I use
6 the user-interface object?” question type”, as claim 1 recites.

7 Please now refer to operations 246 and 248 of figure 8, which are also cited
8 by the Action. Referring to figure 8, operation 246 clearly teaches sending the
9 request to the server. Operation 248 clearly teaches receiving the request by the
10 server. For the reasons already discussed, the sent and received request of Grewal
11 does not teach or suggest “the request for context-sensitive help being based on a
12 “What is the user-interface object?” or a “Why would I use the user-interface
13 object?” question type”, as claim 1 recites.

14 In view of the above, a system of Gallagher, which teaches that a user
15 double-clicks on a log message to receive a detailed explanation of the message,
16 in view of Grewal, which provides users with education, information, and
17 computer-assisted help on a specific subject, problem, or project (i.e., content
18 specific help), does not teach or suggest “the request for context-sensitive help
19 being based on a “What is the user-interface object?” or a “Why would I use the
20 user-interface object?” question type”, as claim 1 recites.

21 Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 USC
22 §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Gallagher in view of Grewal.

23 **Claims 1-9** depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the cited
24 combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC
25

1 §103(a) rejection of claims 1-9 over Gallagher in view of Grewal should be
2 withdrawn.

3 Additionally, claim 3 includes further features that are not taught or
4 suggested by Gallagher in view of Grewal. For example, claim 3 recites
5 “generating the second Web page in a format that is compatible with a platform of
6 the second computer, the platform comprising a hardware platform, an operating
7 system platform, a Web browser type indication, a software version indication, a
8 preferred language indication, an intended use of the second computer, and/or
9 predetermined preferences of a user.” In addressing these claimed features, the
10 Action asserts that Gallagher clearly discloses these features at col. 2, lines 24-50.
11 Applicant respectfully disagrees.

12 Gallagher at col. 2, lines 24-50 recites:

13 *“In such a system 10 there is a main server 12 which is in
14 communication with a plurality of remote agents 14, 16 and 18.
15 Within the server is a manager 20 typically which reports the disk
16 space available on the various applications. The manager 20
17 provides information on a data base 22 and also has a data log 24
18 which is utilized to record log messages regarding the various
19 remote agents 14, 16 and 20 on the distributed network. In a typical
20 system, it is typically not possible to obtain log messages readily
21 from the remote applications. The primary way of actually obtaining
22 those log messages is to look up in a hard copy reference document
23 or searching through online help documentation. The other method
24 is to actually go to the remote application and review the material
25 on that application.*

21 *The present invention utilizes a browser capability to obtain this log
22 information, particularly using a web based user interface which
23 includes this log browsing capability. Furthermore, the present
24 invention includes the ability to obtain a more detailed explanation
25 of the log message which is currently displayed on the browser
simply by double-clicking on the message within the user interface.
To more specifically describe the features of the present invention,*

1 refer now to FIG. 2, which is a block diagram of a distributed
2 TCP/IP system 100 in accordance with the present invention.

3 Accordingly, the system 100 is very similar to that of FIG. 1, except
4 that the manager 120 includes a browser user interface 125.”

5 The above-cited portion of Gallagher clearly discloses that disk space
6 available to various applications is reported, a data log is used to record log
7 messages, log messages are obtained via hardcopy references and online help
8 documentation lookups, browser capabilities are used to obtain the log
9 information, and more detailed explanation of the log messages can be presented.
10 Nowhere does the above-cited portion of Gallagher teach or suggest “generating
11 the second Web page in a format that is compatible with a platform of the second
12 computer, the platform comprising a hardware platform, an operating system
13 platform, a Web browser type indication, a software version indication, a preferred
14 language indication, an intended use of the second computer, and/or
15 predetermined preferences of a user”, as claim 3 recites.

16 The Action does not rely on Grewal to teach or suggest these recited
17 features. It is respectfully submitted that Grewal is completely silent with respect
18 to these recited features.

19 Accordingly, and for these reasons alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of
20 claim 1 over Gallagher in view of Grewal is improper and should be withdrawn.

21 **Claim 10** recites “providing context-sensitive help for a Web-based user
22 interface (UI) of a first computer to a second computer”, “receiving a request for a
23 set of context sensitive help corresponding to a Web-based UI of the first
24 computer, the request being received at the first computer, the Web-based UI
25 comprising a user-interface object and corresponding to one or more functions of

1 the first computer, the Web-based UI being presented on the second computer, the
2 first computer being operatively coupled to the second computer over a network,
3 the context-sensitive help answering a ‘What is the user-interface object?’ or a
4 ‘Why would I use the user-interface object?’ question type”, and “responsive to
5 receiving the request, the first computer: generating a second Web page
6 comprising the context-sensitive help” and “communicating the second Web page
7 to the second computer for presentation.” For the reasons already discussed above
8 with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal does
9 not teach or suggest these claimed features.

10 Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 USC
11 §103(a) rejection of claim 10 over Gallagher in view of Grewal.

12 **Claims 11-18** depend from claim 10 and are allowable over the cited
13 combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC
14 §103(a) rejection of claims 11-18 should be withdrawn.

15 Additionally, claim 12 includes further features that are not taught or
16 suggested by Gallagher in view of Grewal. For example, claim 12 recites
17 “generating the second Web page to be compatible with a platform of the second
18 computer, the platform being comprising an operating system platform, a Web
19 browser platform, a preferred language, an intended use of the second computer,
20 and/or predetermined preferences of a user.” In addressing these claimed features,
21 the Action asserts that Gallagher clearly discloses these features at col. 2, lines 24-
22 50. For the reasons already described above with respect to claim 3, applicant
23 respectively disagrees. For at least those additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a)
24 rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

1 **Claim 19** recites in part “communicating the Web based UI to a different
2 system for presentation”, “responsive to receiving a request for context sensitive
3 help, determining a set of context-sensitive help that corresponds to the Web-
4 based UI, the Web-based UI comprising a user-interface object, the request for
5 context-sensitive help requesting a “What is the user-interface object?” or a “Why
6 would I use the user-interface object?” answer type”, and “communicating the
7 context-sensitive help to the different system for presentation.” For the reasons
8 already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of
9 Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

10 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 19 should be
11 withdrawn.

12 **Claims 20-25** depend from claim 19 and are allowable over the cited
13 combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the respective 35
14 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 20-25 should be withdrawn.

15 **Claim 26** recites in part “[a] user interface comprising [...]a first area for
16 displaying, on a first device, a remote UI that corresponds to a second device the
17 remote UI comprising a user-interface object”, and “a second area within the first
18 area for providing a context-sensitive help control for accessing a set of context
19 sensitive help to answer a “What is the user-interface object?” or a “Why would I
20 use the user-interface object?” question type.” For the reasons already discussed
21 above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of
22 Grewal does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

23 Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 USC
24 §103(a) rejection of claim 26.

1 **Claims 27-31** depend from claim 26 and are allowable over the cited
2 combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, Applicant
3 respectfully request withdrawal of the respective 35 USC §103(a) rejections of
4 claims 27-31.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **Conclusion**

2 The pending claims are in condition for allowance and action to that end is
3 respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the
4 application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance
5 of a subsequent Office action.

6
7 Respectfully submitted,

8
9 Date: 7-05-2005

10 By: Brian G. Hart
11 Brian G. Hart
12 Reg. No. 44,421
13 (509) 324-9256
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25